

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **March 16, 2004**, the examiner reviewed claims 1-33. Claims 1-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Boneh, et al. (USPN 6,134,660, hereinafter “Boneh”).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Independent claims 1, 12, and 23 were rejected as being anticipated by Boneh. Applicant respectfully points out that Boneh teaches **deleting backup data** by deleting an encryption key used to encrypt the backup data (see Boneh, col. 3, lines 5-27). The system of Boneh, however, leaves the **local persistent file unencrypted** (see Boneh, FIG. 2, index 202 and col. 4, lines 17-22). The local persistent file, therefore, cannot be deleted by deleting the encryption key.

In contrast, the present invention encrypts **all copies** of information, **including the local persistent file** (see FIG. 2 and page 10, lines 7-24 of the instant application). There is nothing within Boneh, either explicit or implicit, which suggests encrypting all copies of information, including the local persistent file, so that deleting the encryption key ensures that the set of information is not available within the system. In fact, Boneh teaches away from encrypting the local persistent file (see Boneh, col. 10, lines 50-51 “The system preferably requires no modification to existing file systems.”)

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 12, and 23 to clarify that the present invention encrypts all copies of information, including the local persistent file, so that deleting the encryption key ensures that the set of information is not available within the system.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 12, and 23 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-11, which depend upon claim 1, claims 13-22, which depend upon claim 12, and claims 24-33, which depend upon claim 23, are for the

same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By


Edward J. Grundler

Registration No. 47, 615

Date: April 26, 2004

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
508 Second Street, Suite 201
Davis, CA 95616-4692
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665